

MINUTES OF THE CITY COUNCIL

CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS

Regular Meeting

March 4, 1965  
10:00 A.M.

Council Chamber, City Hall

The meeting was called to order with Mayor Palmer presiding.

Roll call:

Present: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Absent: None

Present also: W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager; Doren R. Eskew, City Attorney; Reuben Rountree, Jr., Director of Public Works; Robert A. Miles, Chief of Police

Invocation was delivered by REVEREND DAVID MICHAEL, Windsor Park Baptist Church.

The Council greeted and welcomed MR. MCKINLEY WARD, Second Year Government Student, University of Texas.

Councilman Long moved that MR. TOM DALY and MR. GREGG LIPSCOMB be heard. The motion was seconded by Councilman LaRue. Roll call showed a unanimous vote.

MR. GREGG LIPSCOMB, President of the Student Assembly, University of Texas, expressed concern over the lack of communication between the students and the City of Austin, due to deficiencies on the part of the students' not coming before the Council expressing their feelings. Their primary interest today was traffic conditions, growing volume of cars, and security of the pedestrians in the University area. He presented Mr. Daly who read two resolutions, (1) that the Traffic Department be requested to survey the intersection of 21st Street and University Avenue giving serious thought to installing a traffic signal; and (2) that the president of the Students' Association request time to speak before the Council to ask the City to study future separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic on Guadalupe Street from the intersections of 21st to 29th Streets. As a temporary improvement, traffic signals could be installed at other major pedestrian crossings. Mr. Daly said signal lights had been installed recently at 22nd and 25th Streets, but 21st and 26th Streets are still of concern to them. The layout and general circulation was designed for a residential area about 75 years ago, and that long range plans should be laid for the future. MR.

LIPSCOMB pointed out the University had 25,000 students and would continue expanding. The Drag has become almost a mall. Proposals suggested were that Guadalupe be made a mall and traffic rerouted, or lowering the traffic and building ramps over the street. Other problems are the volume of traffic in front of the dormitories, possible solution of one-way streets and rerouting; and parking meters are problems in that they are for an hour, and students cannot get from their class to the parking meter in the hour's time. There is an increasing intensity of the problems, and that is why they wanted to come before the Council. Mayor Palmer expressed appreciation in their interest stating every student has a right for an audience before the Council and it would be glad to meet with them and discuss some of their problems. Councilman Long asked that they file their resolutions with the City Clerk. Councilman Long moved that the Traffic Department make a study of these requests and come back with a recommendation to the Council as soon as possible. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

The Mayor pointed out the City had been engaged in a mass transportation study for eight months, and the Council had an opportunity to preview this and there are quite some elaborate plans on Guadalupe and all of these would have to be coordinated. Councilman Long inquired if they had petitioned the Board of Regents to provide more parking spaces, as it was going to be necessary to get some relief from the University as well as from the City. Councilman Long suggested that the students contact their legislators to see if the University could have the authority to create parking areas. Councilman LaRue expressed his appreciation for their giving the Council Members an opportunity to meet with them, and thanked Mr. Daly and Mr. Lipscomb for the manner in which they presented their requests, expressing hope for an opportunity of meeting with them again.

Councilman Long moved that the Minutes of February 25, 1965, and the Supplement to the Minutes of January 14, 1965, be approved. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

Mayor Palmer introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE APPROVING AND ADOPTING THE WRITTEN STATEMENT AND REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS, SHOWING THE ESTIMATES OF THE TOTAL COSTS OF ALL THE IMPROVEMENTS, THE ESTIMATES OF THE COSTS PER FRONT FOOT PROPOSED TO BE ASSESSED AGAINST THE ABUTTING PROPERTY, AND THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS THEREOF, AND THE ESTIMATES OF VARIOUS OTHER COSTS FOR THE IMPROVING OF PORTIONS OF SUNDRY STREETS IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS, WITHIN THE LIMITS HEREINBELOW DESCRIBED, AND OF OTHER MATTERS RELATING THERETO; DETERMINING AND FIXING THE PORTION OF SAID COSTS AND THE RATE THEREOF PROPOSED TO BE ASSESSED AGAINST AND PAID BY THE ABUTTING PROPERTY, AND THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS THEREOF;

DETERMINING THE NECESSITY OF LEVYING AN ASSESSMENT AGAINST SAID ABUTTING PROPERTY, AND THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS THEREOF FOR THE PORTION OF SAID COSTS APPORTIONED TO THEM; ORDERING AND SETTING A HEARING AT 10:30 O'CLOCK A.M. ON THE 18TH DAY OF MARCH, 1965, IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER OF THE CITY HALL OF AUSTIN, TEXAS, AS THE TIME AND PLACE FOR THE HEARING OF THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS OF SAID ABUTTING PROPERTY AND ALL OTHERS INTERESTED IN SAID ABUTTING PROPERTY OR IN ANY OF THE PROCEEDINGS AND CONTRACT CONCERNING SAID ASSESSMENTS, PROCEEDINGS AND IMPROVEMENTS; DIRECTING THE CITY MANAGER OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS, TO GIVE NOTICE OF SAID HEARING AS REQUIRED BY THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF TEXAS AND THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN; DECLARING AND PROVIDING THAT THIS ORDINANCE SHALL TAKE EFFECT IMMEDIATELY UPON ITS PASSAGE. (Trinity Street and sundry other streets)

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman Long moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

The ordinance was read the second time and Councilman Long moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its third reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

The ordinance was read the third time and Councilman Long moved that the ordinance be finally passed. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

Mayor Palmer introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE APPROVING AND ADOPTING THE WRITTEN STATEMENT AND REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS, SHOWING THE ESTIMATES OF THE TOTAL COSTS OF ALL THE IMPROVEMENTS, THE ESTIMATES OF THE COSTS PER FRONT FOOT PROPOSED TO BE ASSESSED AGAINST THE ABUTTING PROPERTY, AND THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS THEREOF, AND THE ESTIMATES OF VARIOUS OTHER COSTS FOR THE IMPROVING OF PORTIONS OF SUNDRY STREETS IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS, WITHIN THE LIMITS HEREINBELOW DESCRIBED, AND OF OTHER MATTERS RELATING THERETO; DETERMINING AND FIXING THE PORTION OF SAID COSTS AND THE RATE THEREOF PROPOSED TO BE ASSESSED AGAINST AND PAID BY THE ABUTTING PROPERTY, AND THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS THEREOF; DETERMINING THE NECESSITY OF LEVYING AN ASSESSMENT

AGAINST SAID ABUTTING PROPERTY, AND THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS THEREOF FOR THE PORTION OF SAID COSTS APPORTIONED TO THEM; ORDERING AND SETTING A HEARING AT 10:30 O'CLOCK A.M. ON THE 18TH DAY OF MARCH, 1965, IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER OF THE CITY HALL OF AUSTIN, TEXAS, AS THE TIME AND PLACE FOR THE HEARING OF THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS OF SAID ABUTTING PROPERTY AND ALL OTHERS INTERESTED IN SAID ABUTTING PROPERTY OR IN ANY OF THE PROCEEDINGS AND CONTRACT CONCERNING SAID ASSESSMENTS, PROCEEDINGS AND IMPROVEMENTS; DIRECTING THE CITY MANAGER OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS, TO GIVE NOTICE OF SAID HEARING AS REQUIRED BY THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF TEXAS AND THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN; DECLARING AND PROVIDING THAT THIS ORDINANCE SHALL TAKE EFFECT IMMEDIATELY UPON ITS PASSAGE. (Canyon Street and sundry other streets)

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman Long moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

The ordinance was read the second time and Councilman Long moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its third reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

The ordinance was read the third time and Councilman Long moved that the ordinance be finally passed. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

Councilman Long inquired if any attempts to get 9th Street opened all the way through to Red River were being made. The Director of Public Works stated efforts were still underway.

Councilman Long moved that MR. ROD KENNEDY, KHFI-TV be heard. The motion was seconded by Councilman LaRue. Roll call showed a unanimous vote.

MR. ROD KENNEDY announced that the Board of Directors of the Corporation, KHFI-TV, aware of the needs of the Police Department for personnel, had sought to encourage the seeking of a career as a patrolman, and it felt that by establishing a "Rookie of the Year" award for the Austin Police Department, it might help to give some attention to the awards and create some incentive. It had established the "KHFI Rookie of the Year Award", in that it would encourage the recruiting for additional career men of high calibre for the Austin Police Department; to encourage honorable and dedicated service at the time of the

patrolman's career during the time the performance habits and standards were being developed; and to give public recognition of outstanding service and accomplishment for new patrolmen. The award would consist of an engraved watch and plaque. The Chief of Police Staff would be asked to furnish service records of three patrolmen that it would nominate. The other two patrolmen not selected as the "Rookie of the Year" would receive from KHFI a plaque for outstanding service. The first awards for the class that was graduated in January would be made in March or April, 1966. He hoped this would contribute to the ever continuing improvement of what is already the finest Police Department in the Nation. Chief Miles expressed gratitude to the Corporation for establishing this award as it would have a desired effect in recruiting and training. Mayor Palmer thanked Mr. Kennedy, and stated all the News Media did an excellent job in assisting Chief Miles in recruiting this last class, and it was a very effective campaign, and brought in some very fine men. The Chief said this was the first time the Department was at full strength since 1948. The City Attorney expressed pride in this recruitment, in that it was not necessary to reduce the requirements in order to come to full strength but to maintain the high standards. Councilman LaRue said more civilian participation was needed, as each year Austin is rated by the National Safety Council; and each time the City is rated in the Police Department, all aspects are rated well except the civilian participation and the educational field, and that he was certainly appreciative of KHFI's participation.

Mayor Palmer introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE ORDERING A CHANGE IN USE AND HEIGHT AND AREA AND CHANGING THE USE AND HEIGHT AND AREA MAPS ACCOMPANYING CHAPTER 39 OF THE AUSTIN CITY CODE OF 1954 AS FOLLOWS:  
(1) THE SOUTH 130 FEET OF THE EAST 80.66 FEET OF LOT 2, BLOCK L, OF THE RIDGETOP ADDITION, FROM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "LR" LOCAL RETAIL DISTRICT; (2) A 8900 SQUARE FOOT TRACT OF LAND BEING A PORTION OF LOT NO. 5 AND ALL OF LOT NO. 2 OF THE JOHN ORR SUBDIVISION, FROM "B" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "O" OFFICE DISTRICT; (3) THE NORTH 128 FEET OF LOT 13, BLOCK 19 OF THE HIGHLANDS ADDITION, FROM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "O" OFFICE DISTRICT; (4) TRACT 1: THE EAST 48 FEET OF LOT 4, THE WEST 12 FEET OF LOT 5, BLOCK 10 GROOM'S ADDITION; TRACT 2: THE EAST 60 FEET OF LOT 5, BLOCK 10 OF THE GROOM'S ADDITION; AND ADDITIONAL AREA: EAST 12 FEET OF LOT 1, LOT 2, LOT 3, AND THE WEST 24 FEET OF LOT 4, FROM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "BB" RESIDENCE DISTRICT; (5) (A) TRACT 1: NORTH 78 FEET OF THE WEST 55 FEET OF LOT 8; PLUS THE SOUTH 50 FEET OF LOT 8, PLUS THE SOUTH 50 FEET OF THE WEST 27.5 FEET OF LOT 7 OF BLOCK 153, ORIGINAL CITY OF AUSTIN, FROM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT AND "B" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "O" OFFICE DISTRICT; AND (B) TRACT 2: EAST 41.5 FEET OF LOT 7, BLOCK 153, ORIGINAL CITY OF AUSTIN, FROM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "O" OFFICE DISTRICT; (6) TRACT 1: LOT 3 (SAVE AND EXCEPT THE WEST 40 FEET OF THE NORTH 75 FEET), CULP SUBDIVISION, AND TRACT 2: THE WEST 40 FEET OF THE NORTH 75 FEET OF LOT 3, CULP SUBDIVISION, FROM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "LR" LOCAL RETAIL DISTRICT; (7) TRACT 1: A 32,670 SQUARE FOOT TRACT OF LAND OUT OF THE THOMAS ELDRIDGE SURVEY,

LOCALLY KNOWN AS 2300-2312 WHELESS LANE, AND TRACT 2: A 9,770 SQUARE FOOT TRACT OF LAND OUT OF THE THOMAS ELDRIDGE SURVEY, LOCALLY KNOWN AS 5909-5915 NORTH HAMPTON DRIVE AND 2201-2219 WHELESS LANE, FROM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT AND FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "GR" GENERAL RETAIL DISTRICT AND SIXTH HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT; (8) A 3.27 ACRE TRACT OF LAND, LOCALLY KNOWN AS 2614-2700 SOUTH LAMAR BOULEVARD AND THE REAR OF 2702-2706 SOUTH LAMAR BOULEVARD, FROM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT AND FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT AND "C" COMMERCIAL DISTRICT AND SIXTH HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "GR" GENERAL RETAIL DISTRICT AND FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT; AND (9) LOTS 5 AND 6, SUDDUTH ADDITION, FROM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "B" RESIDENCE DISTRICT; ALL OF SAID PROPERTY BEING SITUATED IN AUSTIN, TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; AND SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS.

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman Long moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

The ordinance was read the second time and Councilman Long moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its third reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

The ordinance was read the third time and Councilman Long moved that the ordinance be finally passed. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

Mayor Palmer introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE ORDERING A CHANGE IN USE AND CHANGING THE USE MAPS ACCOMPANYING CHAPTER 39 OF THE AUSTIN CITY CODE OF 1954 AS FOLLOWS: A 62,000 SQUARE FOOT TRACT OF LAND IN THE J. P. WALLACE SURVEY NO. 57, BEING PART OF LOTS 1, 2 AND 3 OF RIDGETOP GARDENS, LOCALLY KNOWN AS 1116-1120 EAST 51ST STREET AND 1115-1125 EAST 52ND STREET FROM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "B" RESIDENCE DISTRICT; SAID PROPERTY BEING SITUATED IN AUSTIN, TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; AND SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS.

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman Long moved that the ordinance be passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

Mayor Palmer introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE ORDERING A CHANGE IN USE AND HEIGHT AND AREA AND CHANGING THE USE AND HEIGHT AND AREA MAPS ACCOMPANYING CHAPTER 39 OF THE AUSTIN CITY CODE OF 1954 AS FOLLOWS: BLOCK 5, LOTS 1-5 AND 10-16; BLOCK 6, ALL LOTS IN SAID BLOCK; BLOCK 7, ALL LOTS IN SAID BLOCK BEING LOTS 1-26; BLOCK 9, LOTS 1-20; BLOCK 10, LOTS 1-23; BLOCK 14, LOTS 1-7; BLOCK 15, LOTS 1-3, NORTH 10 FEET OF LOT 4 AND LOTS 9-14; AND BLOCK 16, LOTS 1-9 AND LOTS 17-23; ALL IN GLEN RIDGE SUBDIVISION, FROM "A" RESIDENCE, "O" OFFICE AND "GR" GENERAL RETAIL DISTRICT AND FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "O" OFFICE DISTRICT AND THIRD HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT; ALL OF SAID PROPERTY BEING SITUATED IN AUSTIN, TRAVIS COUNTY TEXAS; AND SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS.

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman LaRue moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

The ordinance was read the second time and Councilman LaRue moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its third reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

The ordinance was read the third time and Councilman LaRue moved that the ordinance be finally passed. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

Councilman Long inquired if in any way any of the Shoal Creek area were being zoned in this particular zoning, that would take away from the value of a Hike and Bike Trail and City park area. The City Attorney replied that was correct, as this application did not purport to zone either Lakeside Boulevard or Alamo Boulevard which is on either side of Shoal Creek, and it does not zone Shoal Creek.

At 10:30 A.M. the Mayor opened the hearing on ordinances annexing ALLAN-DALE PARK, SECTION 9 and unplatted land; and NORTHWEST HILLS MESA OAKS, PHASE 2. No one appeared to be heard. The City Manager pointed out some questions about the unplatted area between the subdivision and Burnet Road and for what it is to be used. He said this was not a part of the hearing, however, and these questions can be cleared before the Council takes final action. He wanted to find out about the future use of it to be assured that necessary drainage, etc., will not be interfered with by whatever use is made of this area and this is the time to try to resolve the question before the property comes into the City. After brief discussion, Councilman LaRue moved that the hearing be closed. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer

Noes: None

Mayor Palmer brought up the following ordinance for its first reading:

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 100.29 ACRES OF LAND, SAME BEING OUT OF AND A PART OF THE GEORGE W. DAVIS SURVEY, IN TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; WHICH SAID ADDITIONAL TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN, IN PARTICULARS STATED IN THE ORDINANCE.  
(Allandale Park, Section 9 and unplatted land)

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman LaRue moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilman LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer

Noes: None

The ordinance was read the second time and Councilman LaRue moved that the ordinance be passed to its third reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer

Noes: None

Mayor Palmer brought up the following ordinance for its first reading:

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 33.50 ACRES OF LAND, SAME BEING OUT OF AND A PART OF THE T. J. CHAMBERS GRANT, IN TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; WHICH SAID ADDITIONAL TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN, IN PARTICULARS STATED IN THE ORDINANCE. (Northwest Hills Mesa Oaks, Phase 2)

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman LaRue moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its second reading. The motion,

March 4, 1965

seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen IaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

The ordinance was read the second time and Councilman IaRue moved that the ordinance be passed to its third reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen IaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

The City Manager submitted the following:

"March 1, 1965

"Mr. W. T. Williams, Jr.  
City Manager  
Austin, Texas

"Dear Mr. Williams:

"Sealed bids were received until 11:00 A.M., Friday, February 19, 1965 at the office of the Director of the Water and Sewer Department for the construction of 5,467 feet of 42-inch Concrete Sanitary Sewer Pipe along LITTLE WALNUT CREEK FROM LOOP 111 TO OLD MANOR ROAD. This project is the first of two contracts that will receive the two temporary Lift Stations at Little Walnut Creek and Old Manor Road and will carry the Little Walnut Creek Sewer Main into the new Treatment Plant on Little Walnut Creek. The bids for the second contract will be received within the next sixty days. These two projects are being coordinated so that they will be completed at the same time the Little Walnut Creek Treatment Plant is completed. The bids were publicly opened and read in the City Council Chamber of the Municipal Building, Austin, Texas.

"The following is a tabulation of bids received:

<u>"Firm</u>	<u>Base Bid</u>	<u>Bid with Liner</u>	<u>Working Days</u>
Ford-Wehmeyer, Incorporated	\$155,283.00	\$211,902.95	75
H & M Construction Corporation	164,420.80	222,419.50	120
B & T Construction Company	164,785.48	224,790.70	150
Austin Engineering Company	185,667.30	251,324.60	125
Bland Construction Company	189,847.60	249,539.20	120
S.A.C.C., Incorporated	213,892.41	281,583.16	120
Walter Schmidt	221,358.00	298,760.00	150
City of Austin (Estimate)	198,298.31	258,191.26	150

"It was decided to design the Walnut Creek Sewer for the long range potential of the drainage area rather than install a small line now, with additional lines in the same drainage area later. This approach has only one drawback, namely that the sewer being underloaded, for a time, is subject to deterioration from hydrogen sulphide gas. Several methods are available to minimize this problem. These methods are chlorination of the sewage at various points along the line, induction of air along the line or a lining in the pipe to prevent this deterioration.

March 4, 1965

"Bids were taken to determine the cost of this liner and the low bid of Ford-Wehmeyer, Incorporated indicates the cost for this section of the line to be \$56,619.95. There is indication that the total cost to line the completed project would amount to approximately \$106,000.00. As indicated in Mr. Ullrich's memo, experiments of a short duration at the Williamson Creek Plant using air induction seem to have a good chance to succeed in solving this problem.

"It is therefore recommended that the low bid of Ford-Wehmeyer, Incorporated for \$155,283.00 without lining be accepted as the lowest and best bid.

"Yours truly,  
s/ Victor R. Schmidt, Jr.  
by Dewey T. Nicholson  
Victor R. Schmidt, Jr.  
Director Water and Sewer Department"

The Council had before it the resolution awarding a contract to FORD-WEHMEYER, INC. for construction of sewer pipe. Councilman LaRue noted that there had been quite an exhaustive and most commendable study made. Councilman Long inquired, since concrete sanitary sewer pipe is the one that deteriorates, why it was recommended over the others, and why other kinds were not explored. Clay pipe was mentioned in the report with the statement there was none in the area. She asked if concrete were the best product in view of the partial testimony. She was not able to determine whether it was better to have the pipe lined, or to use the air method, and what the difference in cost was. The City Manager pointed out the difference between the cost of pipe and liner as shown in the tabulation was \$56,000. Councilman Shanks inquired what the people who knew, like the engineers, recommended. The City Manager stated the liner was something new, and it was unknown if it would last for the period of time estimated. He said the aeration method was new; and although it had been used in other places without success, Austin's approach is different from methods used in other places, and he explained the operation to be used in that the air is drawn in and discharged into the Sewage Treatment Plant and at practically no cost. Councilman Long inquired about the lines that were deteriorating and if this new process would be used in some of them. The City Manager answered at present the aeration method would be used only in the new line in Williamson Creek. Later probably something will be done to other lines throughout the City. Councilman Long inquired about estimates of what a clay pipe would cost. The Assistant Director of Water and Sewer Department stated 42" clay pipe would have to come from the west coast. The cost of a 30" clay pipe would be approximately the same as a 42" concrete lined pipe in place; and the laying costs are about the same, so it would be a difference in the cost of the pipe. A 30" clay pipe equalling the cost of a 42" concrete pipe would have about 30% as much capacity. Councilman Long suggested it would be a good idea to get a bid on the 42" clay pipe and see what it would cost and ask them to bid on something like this. Mr. Nicholson stated a 36" clay pipe ran \$10.00 more than the lined concrete pipe. Councilman Long suggested if the people handling clay pipe had an opportunity to bid on a long 48" line running 5,400' at an expenditure of \$155,000, they might bring this base bid down. Mr. Nicholson said he had talked to them and they say the price differential, when they get into the bigger pipes, becomes greater, and they know from past experience they cannot compete, and that is the reason they were not sent invitations to bid. Councilman Long asked if the only two kinds of pipe that could be used in Austin were the clay and concrete pipe. It was answered that was correct. Councilman Shanks offered the following resolution and moved

its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, bids were received by the City of Austin on February 19, 1965, for the construction of 5,467 feet of 42-inch concrete sanitary sewer pipe along Little Walnut Creek from Loop 111 to Old Manor Road; and,

WHEREAS, the bid of Ford-Wehmeyer, Incorporated, in the sum of \$155,283.00, was the lowest and best bid therefor, and the acceptance of such bid has been recommended by the Director of Water and Sewer Department of the City of Austin, and by the City Manager; Now, Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

That the bid of Ford-Wehmeyer, Incorporated, in the sum of \$155,283.00, be and the same is hereby accepted, and that W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager of the City of Austin, be and he is hereby authorized to execute a contract, on behalf of the City, with Ford-Wehmeyer, Incorporated.

The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:  
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

Mayor Palmer announced it was 10:40 A.M., and the Council would hear a report from the Citizens Committee on Community Improvements presented by MR. DAN CROWLEY, Chairman of the Committee. MR. CROWLEY furnished copies of the recommendations on the Proposed Blackshear Renewal Project. He recognized the members of the Committee who were present, MRS. JOHN BARROW, Secretary; MR. MARTIN KERMACY, University of Texas; DR. J. J. SEABROOK, President, Huston Tillotson College; MR. LEWIS TIMBERLAKE, Executive Vice President, Western Republic Insurance Company; and MR. HOYLE OSBORNE, Planning Department; MR. WAYNE GOLDEN, Director of Urban Renewal Agency; and MR. BOB WORMLEY, Member of the Urban Renewal Board, with whom the Committee had worked. Mr. Crowley read from the report giving a brief history of the request that this certain area be established as an urban renewal project, and the request from the Council that the Citizens Committee review and recommend on the proposed "Blackshear" renewal program. Mr. Crowley stated the Renewal Sub-committee, with Mr. Osborne and Mr. Golden, reviewed this matter very thoroughly; and at a meeting of the 17 member Executive Committee, it was unanimously endorsed and recommended to the City Council that this project be approved. Facts and figures were attached to the report. Councilman Long inquired how many of the 288 sub-standard structures were home owned or tenant occupied. The Director of Planning stated about 50%. Councilman LaRue inquired if there had been any expression from the School System and Huston Tillotson. Mr. Crowley said the school board is planning to enlarge Blackshear School and provide a playground. Huston Tillotson is interested in acquiring land immediately west of their present campus. The Mayor pointed out this was community improvement, and was not for the benefit of the school or the college, but was a community improvement program. Mayor Palmer stated if the Council should go into this renewal, it would be referred to the Planning Commission for the best use, and it would determine how many acres would go to the schools and the college, or a plan of development of the entire area. The whole community would have to be studied in light of a community improvement development. Councilman Long stated in the primary study, to find out

March 4, 1965

if this area should be recommended, these things were more or less predetermined it seemed. The Director of the Urban Renewal Agency said what was being determined now is that this is an area subject to planning by the Urban Renewal Agency, and this will be in cooperation with the Planning Division, Parks and Recreation, and School Board, and a specific plan of the Community will be brought back to the Council. Councilman Long expressed concern over doing away with 288 homes and there not being an area at all included in this study where these people would be relocated. This is a choice residential area, where homes might be upgraded, close in where the people could get to the schools, playgrounds, and doctors, but these people will be dispersed farther out in the East Austin Area. Mr. Golden said a plan for relocation would be worked out for any family living in the area. There will be housing available in the Kealing project, and land will be available for people who have to move out of the Blackshear area. Councilman Long asked that the questions she was asking be incorporated in the study--and those were that the price of land not be such that those people who have to move out of the Blackshear area could not rebuild; that an area be found close in where these people could relocate rather than being moved farther out. Mr. Golden said in certain areas between Manor Road and 19th and South of 19th along Chicon there are houses that are substantial; and through minor action on the part of the City, this area could be used as a rehousing area. The Planning Director reported a small amount of undeveloped land close in and even though some is high priced; development could be encouraged. He explained the President's recommendation for new Urban Renewal Legislation covering the continuation of, or extension of home owners and location of people into relatively close areas of town. Much of the Legislation is aimed at encouraging the use of the central portion of the city rather than out on the far edges. The price of land in this area would prohibit anything else other than something like town houses, with individual ownership of individual units.

The City Attorney stated the State law prohibits the adoption or the completion of any plan which does not do what Mrs. Long suggested might be done. The Plan must prove that the people who will be displaced will be relocated in decent, safe, sanitary housing within their means. That has to be studied. Before that point is reached, the area has to be found by the Council to be a deteriorating, blighted, or slum area, so that it can be upgraded. Councilman Long stated it probably is that the land of these 288 homes will be used for Huston-Tillotson expansion and for Blackshear School. This is the outline of the plan, and the way it would turn out. She said she was interested in seeing a lot of houses being built within the perimeter where these people are now placed.

Mayor Palmer stated there was a real fine Committee and it had done a very detailed study, and it is recommending there is enough evidence that it should be studied. Councilman Long again stated she wanted these matters considered in this study, that she wanted to know that these 288 people who are now living close in, and have access to the hospital, stores, commercial areas, and busses, are going to be replaced in some area similar to that where they were and will have better homes. The City Attorney stated the plan may disclose that it is impossible to do what she had suggested be done; and for that reason it may be desired not to go any further after the study is made; if the study discloses the objectives she had outlined are unattainable the plan would go no further.

Mayor Palmer stated the Council was looking at the community as a community improvement. The first study shows there is a substandard group of houses. It would not be good to leave it there in its present condition just so the people could be close in and have the area to continue to deteriorate. If there is an area where there is an undue amount of hazards from fire, health or safety stand-points, this then becomes a community concern. With the fine detailed study submitted, it is apparent it needs further study. He stated the answers would be

brought in and another public hearing held. Councilman LaRue stated in the Kealing project some of the houses were being rehabilitated and some are being demolished, and asked Mr. Golden if this same situation would hold in this Blackshear project. Mr. Golden explained this was a different type, but there were areas that could be salvaged. Councilman LaRue moved that the Council accept the Committee's recommendation and appreciation be expressed to the Citizens Committee for Community Improvement. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

Councilman LaRue offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, under Title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (herein referred to as "Title I"), the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized to extend financial assistance to local public agencies in the elimination and prevention of the spread of their slums and urban blight through the planning and undertaking of urban renewal projects; and

WHEREAS, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the regulations of the Housing and Home Finance Agency effectuating that Title, provide that no person shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination in the undertaking and carrying out of urban renewal projects assisted under Title I of the Housing Act of 1949; as amended; and

WHEREAS, it is desirable and in the public interest that the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Austin make surveys and prepare plans, presently estimated to cost approximately One Hundred and Fifty-Six Thousand Dollars (\$156,000.00), in order to undertake and carry out an urban renewal project of the character contemplated by Section 110(c) of Title I, in that area proposed as an Urban Renewal Area, situated in the City of Austin, County of Travis, and State of Texas, which is particularly described in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes; Now, Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

1. That the proposed Urban Renewal Area described above is a slum, blighted, deteriorated, or deteriorating area appropriate for an urban renewal project and that the undertaking by the Urban Renewal Agency of surveys and plans for an urban renewal project of the character contemplated by Section 110(c) of Title I in the proposed Urban Renewal Area is hereby approved.
2. That the financial assistance available under Title I is needed to enable the Urban Renewal Agency to finance the planning and undertaking of the proposed Project.
3. That it is cognizant of the conditions that are imposed in the undertaking and carrying out of urban renewal projects with Federal financial assistance under Title I, including those relating to (a) the relocation of site occupants, (b) the provision of local grants-in-aid, (c) the prohibition of discrimination because of race, color, creed, or national origin, and (d) the requirement that the locality present to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, as a prerequisite to approval of the application described below, a workable program for community improvement, as set forth in Section 101(c) of Title I, for utilizing appropriate public and private resources to eliminate and prevent the development or spread of slums and urban blight.
4. That the United States of America and the Housing and Home Finance

March 4, 1965

CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS

Administrator be, and they hereby are, assured of full compliance by Urban Renewal Agency with regulations of the Housing and Home Finance Agency effectuating Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

5. That it is the sense of this body (a) that a feasible method for the relocation of individuals and families displaced from the Urban Renewal Area, in conformity with Title I, can be prepared, and (b) that the local grants-in-aid can and will be provided in an amount which will be not less than one-third of the Net Project Cost of the Project and which, together with the Federal capital grant, will be generally equal to the difference between Gross Project Cost and the proceeds or value of project land sold, leased, or retained for use in accordance with the urban renewal plan.

6. That the filing of an application by the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Austin for an advance of funds from the United States of America to enable it to defray the cost of the surveys and plans for an urban renewal project in the proposed Urban Renewal Area described is hereby approved.

EXHIBIT "A"

Being that certain area lying and being situated in the City of Austin, Travis County, Texas, which is more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at the intersection of the south line of Rosewood Avenue and the east line of Chicon Street;

THENCE, in a southerly direction with the east line of Chicon Street to its intersection with the south line of East 7th Street;

THENCE, in a westerly direction with the south line of East 7th Street to its intersection with the west line of Comal Street;

THENCE, in a northerly direction with the west line of Comal Street to its intersection with the south line of East 11th Street;

THENCE, in a westerly direction with the south line of East 11th Street to its intersection with the westerly prolongation of the north line of Rosewood Avenue;

THENCE, in a northeasterly direction with the prolongation of the north line of Rosewood Avenue and thereafter with the north line of Rosewood Avenue to the west line of the Kealing Project in the City of Austin;

THENCE, in a southerly direction with the west line of the Kealing Project to its intersection with the south line of Rosewood Avenue;

THENCE, in an easterly direction with the south property line of Rosewood Avenue to the place of beginning.

The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:  
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

Mayor Palmer stated the entire Council wanted to express its appreciation to the Committee for this study, and it is a step in the right direction.

MR. JOHN WINDSOR, Real Estate Board, stated it would expand its participation as they had done, in relocating people. The Board was fortunate in relocating many of them.

Councilman LaRue offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, a certain easement was granted to the City of Austin for public utility and drainage purposes in, upon and across a part of Lot 9, Block H, Northway Crest, Section Two, a subdivision of a portion of the James P. Wallace Survey Number 57 in the City of Austin, Travis County, Texas, according to a map or plat of said Northway Crest, Section Two, of record in Book 6 at Page 36 of the Plat Records of Travis County, Texas; and,

WHEREAS, the owners of the above described property have requested the City Council of the City of Austin to release the hereinafter described portion of said easement; and,

WHEREAS, the City Council has determined that the hereinafter described portion of said easement is not now needed and will not be required in the future; Now, Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

That the City Manager of the City of Austin be, and he is hereby authorized to execute a release of the following described portion of said public utility and drainage easement, to-wit:

A strip of land seven and one-half (7.50) feet in width, same being out of and a part of Lot 9, Block H, Northway Crest, Section Two, a subdivision of a portion of the James P. Wallace Survey Number 57 in the City of Austin, Travis County, Texas, according to a map or plat of said Northway Crest, Section Two, of record in Book 6 at page 36 of the Plat Records of Travis County, Texas; said strip of land being more particularly described as follows:

BEING all of the southeast one hundred and thirty-nine (139.00) feet of the northeast seven and one-half (7.50) feet of said Lot 9, Block H, Northway Crest, Section Two.

The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:  
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

The City Manager had received a request from a property owner on the northeast corner of West Avenue and 13½ Street who wants to put a retaining wall on the sidewalk area. This would improve the situation; as at this time there are no sidewalks, and he is planning to construct one about 6' wide. The Public Works Director said a dwelling is being converted into an office. He described the area stating there were no sidewalks between 13th and 14th Streets on the east side of West Avenue. The owners agreed to construct the sidewalk in line with those to the north and south, and the face of the retaining wall would be 8½ feet from the curb. There is an existing wall in the 13½ Street sidewalk area, and they want to continue that wall and tie into the wall on West Avenue which would leave a three foot walk along 13½ Street. That wall was in place at the time the City acquired the right of way many years ago. Councilman Long asked if the right could be reserved that if and when the street were widened,

that the City would not have to replace the wall. The City Attorney explained it would be required that they exercise a release, in the event the street was widened, the wall would be removed at their expense. Councilman Long moved that the Council grant the request as outlined by the City Manager and Director of Public Works. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

The City Manager reported a request from a developer to permit them to dedicate a wider street at two entrances of their subdivision and create within this wider street some small median strips. He stated he did not look with favor on this as these islands would create additional problems to the City in the future. The Traffic Department did not think this would be a good idea. The Director of Public Works stated these were for permanent installation at four intersections off of Old Manor Road at Susquehanna Lane, and one at Rockhurst; and off of Loyola Lane on Barnard Drive, and Kings Point Lane. They want to plant low shrubs selected by a landscape architect, and maintained by an underground irrigation system; and construction, etc. would be at no expense to the City. The drives will be 15' wide entering into a 60' street. The City Manager stated this definitely would create hazards. The Traffic Engineer did not recommend this, and stated traffic signs would have to be placed in the islands. The Director of Public Works likewise did not recommend these islands. The City Attorney stated recently there had been three Texas Supreme Court decisions that make it crystal clear of what the liability is here. Management of Traffic Control has had a connection with the physical construction placed in the street; but in this case, it is purely an esthetic desire on the part of the subdivider; and if this is permitted, the City would be paying all the costs of all the damages personal injury and automobile destruction, etc. Councilman Long inquired about the island on Guadalupe. The City Attorney stated this was for traffic management. The Traffic Engineer made a study and there is a record of engineering determination citing the reasons for the management of traffic. This is a different matter. The Director of Public Works stated the streets were in place. The Council decided to go look at these intersections.

The City Manager stated MR. STEVE PRICE has an interest in land on Reinli, Highway 290 and Airport Boulevard. He wants permission to cross the right of way property to have better access to his property. The Director of Public Works showed on a map Reinli curving into the large intersection of Highway 290. Reinli is being widened to a 60' right of way all the way to the Interregional. The owner will dedicate the 15' needed; and in addition he needs permission to cross City property in order to provide a 30' driveway. It is not an exchange of property, but a permit to cross City property, and he will pave the drive. The City Manager recommended granting the permission. Councilman Long moved that the Council accept the recommendation of the City Manager and Director of Public Works and grant the requested permission. The motion, seconded by Councilman Shanks, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None  
Not in Council Room when roll was called: Councilman White

The City Attorney stated it would be a disadvantage to the owner for the

City not to obtain a street deed from him on a portion of his property and grant him an easement; and it would be advantageous for the City to go ahead and get a street deed to the triangular tract. Members of the Council agreed.

Councilman LaRue offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Austin declared its intention to construct a reservoir on Decker Creek by Council action of the 22nd day of December, 1964; and,

WHEREAS, at the time of this determination, the City Council directed administrative personnel of the City of Austin to proceed with the necessary steps to permit the construction of such reservoir; and,

WHEREAS, in compliance with this directive of the City Council there was duly filed with the Texas Water Commission the City of Austin's application to be permitted an additional water diversion under its existing permit and to be permitted to impound waters from Decker Creek, said application being dated the 19th day of February, 1965; Now, Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

That the aforementioned application be and the same is ratified and confirmed in all particulars as the act and deed of the City of Austin.

The motion, seconded by Councilman Shanks, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, Mayor Palmer

Noes: None

Not in Council Room when roll was called: Councilman White

The City Manager stated the City Attorney had a communication from the town of Sunset Valley about annexing authorities. The City Attorney stated the Council had approved an agreement which was stated by the Governing Body of Sunset Valley to be satisfactory with them to eliminate all questions of overlapping jurisdiction. After the instruments were delivered to the Body, they decided not to execute them. Sunset Valley now has requested to be permitted to annex 30 acres of land under two different ownerships, within the overlapping jurisdiction of Austin and that City. One area is adjacent to Williamson Creek. Although there is not now a sewer line in Williamson Creek at that point the plan is to install a line there, and investment has been made in sizing and constructing a large line downstream, large enough to serve the area which they are asking to be a part of Sunset Valley. Councilman Long wanted to drive over the area, stating she was not inclined to block off 30 acres for annexation to Sunset Valley. Mayor Palmer asked if this were in Water District No. 9. The City Manager pointed out the contract with Water District 9 says if any of the property becomes the property of another city, Austin cannot serve it with water. The Mayor asked for a map to identify the area, showing the existing city limit lines, and suggested the Council drive out there next Thursday; also that it be determined if all of the property or any portion is in the Water District.

The City Manager stated last week the Council looked at a situation on Steck Avenue and Missouri Pacific Boulevard, concerning a tract of land on the east side of the Railroad, north of Steck Avenue, and belonging to the railroad which has leased it for a lumber yard and warehouse area. Recently that tract of land along with other land to the east of it was redesignated in the Master Plan as residential. The lessee of the railroad developed the facility for unloading lumber, and he needs water. The policy is that the City does not serve water to customers violating the Master Plan. The City Manager inquired if the Council wanted to change this area back. The Mayor stated if the land is legally included, the Council had intended to exclude it; and whatever it takes to get it taken out, he wanted that done. The City Manager asked if the Council did intend for it to be industrial; and if it were not, the Council wanted to put it back as it was. Council Members agreed. The Mayor stated it was not the intention of the Council to include this in the residential designation. The City Attorney stated he would find out what was done, and it may be the maps and descriptions are such that clarification of the record will be sufficient to put this into effect.

The Council recessed until 2:30 P.M.

RECESSED MEETING

2:30 P.M.

At 2:30 P.M. the Council resumed its meeting.

Discussion was held on the Shoal Creek Hike and Bike Trail extension. Councilman Long suggested getting easements from behind the houses in the area. The Recreation Director pointed out there was a bluff line on the other side that prevents anybody that might walk on a trail from even looking into a yard, and this would be the logical side for the easement, and then he recommended crossing the creek with stepping stones. Otherwise private property would be invaded. The Mayor asked that he and the Director of Public Works work out the feasibility of getting the path in there, and on which side they preferred to have it and whether or not the easements should be obtained to bring people up on the street and down 31st. The City Attorney stated the City would not be interested in having the easement along the west property line in any event because it is preferable to bring the trail along the creek. The Mayor asked if the City Attorney would explain to Mr. Russell Fish that they were trying to work the trail out along Shoal Creek, and asked that the Recreation Director and Director of Public Works decide which way it could be done from an engineering standpoint and which would work out the nicest from the esthetics standpoint.

The City Manager brought up Mr. R. G. Mueller's request to purchase the property on which the City was going to place a service yard. The Mayor stated Mr. Mueller should be told it is either going to be put up for sale, or the yard is going to be established there. The Director of Public Works submitted and explained in detail a sketch on a proposed service yard at the location at Center and South 1st Streets. The Mayor asked if the tower were needed. The Director of Public Works stated it would work out very well for their communications. The City Manager recommended inquiring about purchasing the land with the tower. The City Manager pointed out the location of Center Street and South 1st Street, stating if the City continued to grow to the southwest the other tract would be better. If it develops to the southeast, the South 1st Street site would be better. The

Mayor suggested that they proceed to make their contacts to acquire the other land, and apply for a special permit.

The City Manager said several water districts had been purchased; and when Water District No. 4 was purchased, the contract provided that when the district's water usage and number of customers, etc., was such that a fair return could be made on the investment in the system at a lower rate than the existing water district rate, the rate would be reduced. The rate can be reduced in Water District No. 4 to the regular outside the city limits water rate, to  $1\frac{1}{2}$  times that of the City. The district rate is about  $2\frac{1}{2}$  times the rate.

In former Water Districts No. 6 and 7, the rates can be reduced to 80% of their present rates, and a fair return could be made on the investments in those districts. Councilman Shanks noted this was running ahead of the conjecture. Councilman LaRue asked what the shortest period of time was taken to get them in this position. The City Manager stated it took District No. 4 nearly two and a half years, and Nos. 6 and 7 a little over a year. The City Manager had a schedule of the suggested rates for Nos. 6 and 7; and with reference to No. 4, since the rate will be the same as the City charges customers outside the City limits where they are not in a water district, a new schedule will not be needed on that, but just charge the "outside the city" rate. The City Manager stated since a new "outside the city limit" general service rate was adopted, a check had been made to see that these rates would not go below the rates to the other customers.

Councilman Shanks moved that the Council adopt the following rates for Water Systems Nos. 6 and 7 effective on service used after March 1, 1965:

WATER SYSTEMS NOS. 6, 7  
FORMERLY  
TRAVIS COUNTY WATER CONTROL & IMPROVEMENT DISTRICTS

Water Rate Schedule

First	1,500 Gallons	\$2.00
Next	2,000 Gallons	.72
Next	12,500 Gallons	.64
Next	34,000 Gallons	.48
Next	200,000 Gallons	.30
Excess		.28

The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:  
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

Councilman Long moved that the Council adopt the regular "outside the city" rate for Water District No. 4 ( $1\frac{1}{2}$  times the City rate), effective on service used after March 1, 1965. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

March 4, 1965

The City Manager brought up for discussion the purchase of a bookmobile, stating one manufacturer, THE GERSTENSLAGER COMPANY, is a specialist in making bodies for library trailers, and the City purchased one before, and needs another. The question has to do about the purchase. There is only one manufacturer who makes bodies especially for that use. Someone might tailor make one, and it would not be known if it would prove up to the same quality. Before, it was concluded by the Council that the special body was superior to any that could be bid at the same price. The City Attorney reported that the Library group had been in contact with the GERSTENSLAGER COMPANY and had received quotations last fall. In December the Company increased their price 6% effective January, but they continued negotiating with the Librarian keeping the matter open at the same prices quoted until April 1st. The bookmobile in question is about the same price, as paid before, but it is larger. The only company that came close to this price had been contacted four times, but no answer was received. The Mayor asked that the Friends of the Library be present next Thursday, to tell where the Bookmobile is needed and where it will be used. Councilman Long wanted to know if they were going to build any new libraries any time soon, as East Austin was asking for a larger library. The City Manager stated no new libraries were being planned; that a new branch may be opened in rented space. There is money for the purchase of land for future sites, but none for building libraries, during this bond issue. It was suggested that the Library Board be present next Thursday.

The Mayor inquired about the Ordinance calling the Election. The City Attorney stated it could be called next Thursday.

The Mayor stated MR. RUSSELL ROBERSON and a group representing the Red Cross raised some money for a building, but not enough to build and purchase a site. They are asking if the City would have a site available about 100' x 200' for them to enter into a lease agreement and build on City land. They would like to have an easy access to a bus line and be centrally located. Councilman Long expressed her feelings that there were a lot of fine organizations; and if the City sets a precedent of leasing its properties to one, it would have to do it for all, and it is a bad precedent to set. Many contribute to this fund to help the Red Cross, and it would be better off to have its own building and its own money. The Mayor asked about the participation of the Red Cross in the Life Saving and Water Safety Programs. The Director of Recreation replied the Red Cross participation was a necessity in these programs. Councilman Long pointed out other organizations likewise made contributions to the community, and several organizations were mentioned. Councilman Long stated there was a difference between private charity and public charity, and Red Cross is classified as private charity with private funds.

Councilman Shanks mentioned other leases and he would certainly say the Red Cross was an integral part of the community. Councilman LaRue stated the Auditorium was handled on the same basis, all paying when they use it; and although there is a different rate for non profit organizations, they still pay. He said he would be willing to contribute to their finding their place, as that would be the best solution. They definitely need a place, but there is none available. Councilman Shanks wanted to go on record as saying he was willing to find a place for them. Councilman LaRue said if the City has to decide which of these organizations to accomodate, it would be hard to defend its position without providing for all of them. Councilman Shanks said when there was as well established non profit organization which is an integral part of the Community as the Red Cross, the City should go out of its way to establish them as a part of

the community by cooperating with them if there are facilities available. If the Red Cross did not provide these services, they would have to be provided through taxes. Mayor Palmer suggested it might be well to have MR. ROBERSON and his committee come before the Council and explain what they need and present their program to the Council.

Mayor Palmer stated all of the Council Members were receiving letters urging the Council to purchase MOUNT BONNELL. It is such a real part of Austin, and the cost is going to be a real item, and he suggested appointing a committee consisting of members of the Planning Commission, Chamber of Commerce, Real Estate Board, Bankers Association, Audubon Society and others to look and study this in the light of approximately what is involved in the way of money, and whether or not the public interest could be best served by investing in that land considering the amount of money involved. He listed various organizations that had endorsed the purchase. Councilman Shanks suggested before the Council appointed the committee that it determine what is involved so it can equip the committee with what their problem is. Councilman LaRue concurred. Councilman Shanks believed there was a misconception on the part of the public that the mountain was going to be destroyed. The Mayor stated it was known Mount Bonnell would remain. Councilman Long said that most of the people writing in, knew exactly what is there, they know for what they are asking, and they are under no misconception. They are interested in preserving as much of it as they can. She suggested having a bond issue and letting the people vote on it. It was pointed out the bond money on hand was already committed, and there is no money available. Councilman Shanks stated this committee should be equipped with the facts. Councilman Long suggested the people may want a bond issue and increase their taxes to preserve Mount Bonnell. It may be they will say it would cost \$350,000 - \$500,000 and increase the tax rate five cents. Councilman LaRue said the people talking to him seemed to be interested in three or four acres--the land west of the road. It was pointed out that was 15 acres, and the Planning Commission had recommended that the City acquire the portion of the land west of the road. The Director of Recreation stated he thought perhaps a strip of about 200' x 400' would be all that would be necessary to preserve the view downstream from the crest of the hill. He pointed out it was a scenic park--not a play park. Councilman Shanks suggested sitting down with the owners and working out some arrangement. Councilman LaRue stated the recommendation of the Recreation Director sounded good to him. Councilman Shanks said this would be one of the most beautiful sections of Austin; and at the same time the mountain would be preserved. He stated if it were taken to the people, the people of Austin could have everything they were willing to pay for. The Mayor stated before that is done, there should be a strong committee. The City Manager listed the commitments for purchases of land for the next five years, and every bit of the money available for that period is committed. The Mayor stated this was something that had a value, part esthetic, part historical, and otherwise, but it will be a terrific amount of money. Some will say the City is putting that much money out on the hill and no one using it; others will say "why did you let the land go?" A broad opinion is needed on this type of issue. Councilman Long suggested outlining the purpose of this broad committee and set out that they are to make findings of the cost; interview the different land owners; find out what a cross section of the people think; and if it were purchased, where they would suggest the money would come from, and other questions to be answered. The City Attorney stated if the street is not vacated that is another consideration as far as the view is concerned. The Mayor asked the Council to think about all of this and try to come up with something next Thursday.

March 4, 1965

There being no further business Councilman LaRue moved that the Council adjourn. The motion, seconded by Councilman Shanks, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer  
Noes: None

The Council adjourned at 4:00 P.M. subject to the call of the Mayor.

APPROVED

*Lester E. Palmer*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

ATTEST:

*Elvis Wozley*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
City Clerk